## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,520	06/19/2003	Shizhong Liu	MCS-005-03 (303702.01)	8588
Mark A. Watso	7590 02/01/200	8	EXAM	INER
Lyon & Harr			CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
Suite 800 300 Esplanade Drive		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Oxnard, CA 93030			2621	
			MAN DATE	DEL WENY MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/600,520	LIU ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dave Czekaj	2621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 27 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:  a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS  2. The proposed amendment/s) filed often a final rejection, but reject to the data of filing a brief will not be contacted because						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the</li> </ul>						
non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of						
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.						
		•				

Continuation of 13. Other: On pages 2-7, applicant argues that Straasheijm in view of Ma fail to disclose evaluating a second and third set of MVs for each the first set was deemed not reliable. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Ma, column 10 line 61 - column 11, line 35. There Ma discloses identifying true MVs from irregular, or non-reliable, MVs. Ma then discloses at a second level, identification or evaluation using the irregular MVs. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

MEHRDAD DASTOURI SUPERVISORY PATENTEX AMINER

TC 2600

Lehrdad Dastoni